Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 15-17 are presented for consideration. Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, at least, for example, on page 16, line 18, *et seq*. Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Robar et al. (U.S. 6,826,313) in view of Yoshida (U.S. 6,178,005) and Dow et al. (U.S. 6,784,904) and further in view of Parulski et al. (U.S. 5,414,811). At least for the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 relates to a method of reading a plurality of film originals, each being mounted with a slide mount, which are placed on an original support of an image reading apparatus in a plurality of orientations, and displaying the plurality of film originals on a monitor unit of a computer connected to the image reading apparatus. The method includes an image reading step, a placement orientation detection step, a display orientation setting step, an image signal rotation step, and a read image signal display step. In the image reading step each of the plurality of film originals placed on the original support is read, a number of frames of film originals simultaneously present on the original support is identified, and image areas for each of the frames of film originals are cut out to generate a plurality of image signals. In the placement orientation detection step a placement orientation for each of the plurality of film originals is detected based on lengths in horizontal and vertical directions of each image signal. In the display orientation setting step a display orientation for the plurality of image signals is set from

among (i) a landscape orientation, (ii) an orientation where each of the plurality of image signals is rotated by a predetermined angle regardless of the detected placement orientation for each of the plurality of film originals, and (iii) an orientation corresponding to the detected placement orientation for each of the plurality of films originals. In the image signal rotation step a first image signal rotation, a second image signal rotation, or no image signal rotation is executed in accordance with the set display orientation for the plurality of images signals. The first image signal rotation rotates each of the plurality of images signals to be in the landscape orientation. The second image signal rotation rotates each of the plurality of image signals by a predetermined angle irrespective of the detected placement orientation detected. The read image signal display step simultaneously displays the plurality of image signals on one display screen of the monitor unit according to the display orientation set in the display orientation setting step and in a form of a thumbnail type display.

Robar et al. relates to a method and automated system for creating volumetric data sets. Robar et al. discloses that a number of films are scanned and digitized. Software then separates, orients, and sequences the scanned images by detecting vertical and horizontal edges of exposed films in the scanned images. The software includes an image extraction algorithm which locates a fiducial mark in each scanned image. Once the software detects the position of the fiducial marks 18 the sequence and orientation of the scanned images can be determined. If necessary, the software rotates and/or flips each image so that it is properly oriented. (Robar et al., c. 6, l. 8 – c. 7, l. 9). Accordingly, Applicant submit that in Robar et al. the orientation of the scanned images are set in accordance with the fiducial marks. Therefore, Applicant submits, that Robar et al. cannot be said to disclose, among other features, a display orientation setting step of setting a display orientation for the plurality of image signals from among: (i) a landscape orientation,

(ii) an orientation where each of the plurality of image signals is rotated by a predetermined angle regardless of the placement orientation for each of the plurality of film originals detected in the placement orientation detection step, and (iii) an orientation corresponding to the placement orientation for each of the plurality of films originals detected in the placement orientation detection step, as recited in Claim 1.

Yoshida relates to an image processing apparatus that controls a blank to be a predetermined length in accordance with the size of the recording medium. Yoshida discloses a type of image processing apparatus where a blank space is provided for filing purposes. The apparatus includes a length-to-width conversion circuit 30 which inputs data on signal line 28a and outputs information which is subject to length-to-width conversion, i.e., rotated 90° to the right. (Yoshida, c. 3, l. 1 – c. 4, l. 14). However, Applicant submits that Yoshida does not disclose, among other features, a display orientation setting step of setting a display orientation for the plurality of image signals as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Yoshida fails to remedy the deficiencies of Robar et al. discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Dow et al. relates to an appliance and method for navigating among multiple captured images and functional menus. Dow et al. disclose a portable, hand-held, image capture and communication appliance 22 which includes a flat-panel display, user operation buttons, and user navigation buttons. The user operation buttons allow the user to send, zoom, rotate or delete an image or page that has been scanned into memory. (Dow et al., c. 5, l. 21-41). If the user wishes to change the orientation of a captured image, then activation of the rotation button will rotate the captured image 90° with each invocation. Applicant submits, however, that Dow et al. does not disclose, among other features, a display orientation setting step of setting a display orientation for a plurality of image signals as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits

that <u>Dow et al.</u> fails to remedy the deficiencies of <u>Robar et al.</u> and <u>Yoshida</u> discussed above in regard to Claim 1.

  <u>Parulski et al.</u> relates to a method and apparatus for controlling rapid display of multiple images from a digital image database. Figure 1 of <u>Parulski et al.</u> illustrates a photographic color film processing system such as a photofinishing minilab. When a film strip is originally scanned in the photoprocessing minilab each picture is digitized as though it were horizontally oriented, irrespective of its actual orientation on the film. The digitized image is stored in the workstation's frame store, as is, and a lower resolution version is displayed on the display monitor of a workstation 14, so that the image may be viewed by the operator. As each image is digitized and stored on a disc, the operator enters a set of presentation control codes that are incorporated in the header file associated with a respective image file. Included among these is a command which represents the orientation of the image, and which is stored in the orientation field. When the recorded images are viewed by a user, the images are displayed in accordance with the orientation information in the presentation control file. However, if the orientation code in the presentation control file is in error, due for example to operator error, the user may re-orient the image via rotate buttons 220. (<u>Parulski et al.</u>, c. 6, l. 63 – c. 9, l. 41).

  Accordingly, Applicant submits that <u>Parulski et al.</u> discloses displaying an image in accordance with orientation information stored in a control file, and allowing the user to re-orient the image due to operator error. However, Applicant submits that <u>Parulski et al.</u> does not disclose, among other features, a display orientation setting step of setting a display orientation for the plurality of image signals, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that <u>Parulski et al.</u> fails to remedy the deficiencies of <u>Robar et al.</u>, <u>Yoshida</u>, and <u>Dow et al.</u> discussed above in regard to Claim 1.

Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that even assuming, *arguendo*, that the proposed combination of the applied references is proper, the proposed combination does not disclose features recited in Claim 1.

Claim 15 relates to a system for reading a plurality of film originals, and includes, *inter alia*, a display orientation setting unit for setting a display orientation for the plurality of image signals from among: (i) a landscape orientation, (ii) an orientation where each of the plurality of image signals is rotated by a predetermined angle regardless of the placement orientation for each of the plurality of film originals detected by a placement orientation detector, and (iii) an orientation corresponding to the placement orientation for each of the plurality of film originals detected by a placement orientation detector. In light of the discussion of the applied references above, Applicant submits that even assuming, *arguendo*, that the proposed combination of the applied references is proper, the proposed combination does not disclose, among other features, a display orientation setting unit as recited in Claim 15.

Claims 2, 5, 6, and 16 depend from Claim 1. Claim 17 depends from Claim 15. Accordingly, at least for the reasons discussed above in regard to Claims 1 and 15, Applicant submits that the proposed combination of the applied references, even if proper, does not disclose features recited in Claims 2, 5, 6, 16, and 17.

Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that the claims presented herein are patentable over the applied references. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Walsh/

_____

Sean M. Walsh
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 63,510

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SMW:ayr